

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action dated May 3, 2004. Claim 12 has been canceled, and its subject matter added to independent claim 10. Thus, claims 1-11 and 13-14 are now pending.

This Amendment After Final should be entered since it merely places the subject matter of claim 12 into claim 10, and cancels claim 12.

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Wen in view of Cariffe. This Section 103(a) rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 requires: (a) enlarging or contracting whole image being displayed on the display screen to a size corresponding to a given data amount; and (b) adjusting a cropping cursor size *based on the very same given data amount that was used to enlarge or contract the whole image*. In other words, the whole image is enlarged/contracted and the cursor size is adjusted based on the same given data. This is advantageous, for example, in that the cursor size for manipulation on the whole image can be automatically changed in a manner corresponding to the whole image size change.

The cited art fails to disclose or suggest these aspects of claim 1, either taken alone or in combination. Wen discloses a system for cropping part of an image (e.g., see Fig. 2), and allegedly teaches that the cursor size may be adjusted (e.g., see step 75 in Fig. 7). However, as admitted in the Office Action, Wen fails to disclose or suggest enlarging or contracting whole image being displayed on the display screen to a size corresponding to

a given data amount. Recognizing this fundamental flaw in Wen, the Office Action cites Cariffe which teaches transforming an original image to an icon after cropping. The Section 103(a) rejection is incorrect for at least the following two reasons.

First, Cariffe does not contract an image. Instead, Cariffe transforms the image into an icon, where the image is not even displayed in the icon (e.g., col. 3, lines 18-30). Since Cariffe fails to disclose or suggest enlarging or contracting a whole image being displayed, even the alleged combination (which would be incorrect in any event) still fails to meet the invention of claim 1 since this claimed feature is not present in either of the cited reference. In other words, even the alleged combination of Wen and Cariffe fails to meet the invention of claim 1.

Second, both Wen and Cariffe fail to disclose or suggest adjusting a cropping cursor size *based on the very same given data amount that was used to enlarge or contract the whole image*. There is nothing in either Wen or Cariffe even remotely related to this aspect of claim 1. Again, since both references fail to disclose or suggest this aspect of claim 1, even the alleged combination fails to meet the invention of claim 1. Moreover, one of ordinary skill in the art would never have adjusted the cursor size based on the tiny size of an icon (see the icon in Cariffe) because such a cursor would be useless for cropping purposes.

For at least the aforesaid two reasons, the rejection of claim 1 is incorrect.

The rejection of claim 8 is also incorrect. Claim 8 requires *adjusting a cropping cursor size based on a data amount which is set based on another or external device to*

KINOSHITA

Appl. No. 10/087,768

July 27, 2004

which data is to be transmitted. The cited art fails to disclose or suggest this aspect of claim 8. There is absolutely nothing in Wen, Cariffe, or Warner which discloses or suggests such a concept. Instead, the cited art teaches directly away from the invention of claim 8 because the alleged cursor size adjustment in Wen is entirely unrelated to any external or other device to which data is to be transmitted.

The rejection of claim 10 (previous claim 12) is also incorrect. Claim 10 requires "adjusting the cursor size of the cursor based on the predetermined data amount, so that the size of the cut-out portion from the image is also adjusted based on the predetermined data amount; and wherein the cursor size of the cursor is also adjusted based on a number of usable colors." There is nothing in the cited art, either alone or in combination, which discloses or suggests adjusting a cropping cursor size based on the number of usable colors. The art is entirely unrelated to the invention of claim 10 in this respect.

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully requested that all rejections be withdrawn. All claims are in condition for allowance. If any minor matter remains to be resolved, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned with regard to the same.

KINOSHITA


• Appl. No. 10/087,768

• July 27, 2004

• Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

• By: _____


Joseph A. Rhoa
Reg. No. 37,515

• JAR:caj

• 1100 North Glebe Road, 8th Floor

Arlington, VA 22201-4714

Telephone: (703) 816-4000

Facsimile: (703) 816-4100